



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,820	08/20/2001	Andrew Allen Schinkel		5841

7590 12/09/2002

A. ALLEN SCHINKEL  
INDIGO WIND FILMS INC.  
2268 WEST 45TH AVENUE  
VANCOUVER, BC V6M 2J3  
CANADA

EXAMINER

MOY, JOSEPH MAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3727

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n N .

09/932820

Applicant(s)

SCHUNKEL

Examiner

Joseph Moy

Art Unit

3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/26/02
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Serial Number: 09/932,820  
Art Unit: 3727

Claims 1-3 are finally rejected as set forth in the Office Action dated 09/23/02  
invention.

Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/02 have been fully considered but they are not  
persuasive.

There is no patentable distinction between a tray and the container of Hoilje. A tray as  
claimed without any structure is reasonable is only container. Hoilje shows a container or tray  
with a handle. Such disclosure meet all the claimed language.

Regarding claim 2 , to provide a pouring spout to a container is old as evidenced by both  
Lundy and Ippolito. The mere relocating a pouring spout to any location along the perimeter of a  
container is considered an obvious matter of engineering choice and is not seen of any patentable  
significance. A spout is for pouring is old as shown by the references. A tray with corner is old.  
It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to relocate a pouring spout  
at any location of a container wall such as at the corner area. The test for obviousness is not  
whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the  
primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or  
all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would  
have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ  
871 (CCPA 1981). The fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow  
naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when  
the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat.  
App. & Inter. 1985).

Regarding claim 3, Wakat et al shows all the structures of the device as recited by the claim. Wakat et al shows ribs 32 at the inclined area (see figure 3).

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this office action will be directed to Examiner Joseph Moy, (703) 308-1145. In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720 is encouraging faxing of responses in Office Actions directly into the group at (703) 305-3579 or (703) 305-3580. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by Applicants who authorize charges to a USPTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and the art unit at the top of your cover sheet.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are

missing e.g. copies of references cited, from PTO-1449, form PTO-892., etc requests for copies of such papers should be directed to Errica Bembry at (703)306-4005.

Date: 12/06/2002



**Joseph M. Moy**  
**Primary Examiner**